



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,698	01/11/2002	Kenneth L. Davis	30566.213-US-01	7955

22462 7590 09/07/2005

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

ALAM, UZMA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,698

Applicant(s)

DAVIS, KENNETH L.

Examiner

Uzma Alam

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-19 and 21-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-19 and 21-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on June 17, 2005. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-30 are pending. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are amended. Claims 2, 11 and 20 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-30 represent distributing revision blocks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 12-15, 18, 19, 21-24 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Duffy et al. US Patent Publication No. 2003/0212610. Duffy discloses the invention as claimed including a system and method for specification and exchange management (see abstract).

4. As per claim 1, Duffy discloses a method for distributing design document changes comprising:

(a) capturing an extensible markup language (XML) representation of a revision block of a design document (storing a specification, which has all the details of a design document, including any changes, in an xml format; paragraph 0037-0040, 0045, 0066-0070), wherein:

(i) the revision block documents a history of one or more changes made directly by one or more users to the design document (the specification stores and tracks any changes made to the document and logs details of the changes; 0040, 0075); and

(ii) the revision block comprises a date for each change made directly by the one or more users to the design document (0040); and

(b) distributing the representation via a network service (the specification and the history of all the changes are available over a network0045).

5. As per claim 3, Duffy teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the revision block comprises a table of various document properties (the specification is standardized and the user uses predefined templates to modify the specification; paragraph 0035, 0043, 0051-0054, 0070).

6. As per claim 4, Duffy teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the document properties are customized to meet documentation needs of an organization (the specification is standardized and the user uses predefined templates to modify the specification; paragraph 0035, 0043, 0051-0054, 0070).

7. As per claim 5, Duffy teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the representation is automatically captured (paragraph 0039, 0040).

8. As per claim 6, Duffy teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the representation is captured transparently to a user (paragraph 0039, 0040).

9. As per claim 9, Jones teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the distributing comprises transmitting the representation to the network service via a network, wherein the network service transmits the representation:

to a web site used to track revisions for a project (paragraph 0045, 0066-0068);
to a database used for document management (paragraph 0045, 0066-0068); and
in an email to a design document consumer (paragraph 0045, 0066-0068).

Art Unit: 2157

10. As per claim 28, Duffy teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the revision block further comprises:

A revision number (paragraph 0040, 0075);

A description of each change to the design document (paragraph 0040, 0075); and

A user name for the user that made each change to the design document (paragraph 0040, 0075).

11. Claims 10, 12-15, 18, 19, 21-24, 27, 29 and 30 are rejected with the same rationale as claims 1, 3-6, 9 and 28 because they disclose an apparatus and article of manufacture for the invention, but have the same limitations as claims 1, 3-6, 9 and 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Duffy et al. US Patent Publication No. 2003/0212610 over Jones et al. US Patent No. 6,493,731. Jones teaches the invention as claimed including recording a viewing the history of document use.

14. As per claim 7, Duffy teaches the method of claim 1. Duffy does not teach wherein the representation is distributed to a consumer of the document such that the consumer is notified of

Art Unit: 2157

changes in the document without having to refer to the document directly. Jones teaches wherein the representation is distributed to a consumer of the document such that the consumer is notified of changes in the document without having to refer to the document directly (the user can review the document in context of the resource documents; column 5, lines 1-56; column 6, lines 1-21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the notification of Jones with the specification of Duffy. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this so that the user, such as a buyer, has immediate access to any changes made to his order.

15. As per claim 8, Duffy teaches the method of claim 1. Duffy does not teach further comprising:

updating the representation as additional revisions are added to the revision block; and
redistributing the representation.

ones teaches further comprising:

updating the representation as additional revisions are added to the revision block (the resources are updated; column 4, lines 46-60; column 12, lines 56-67; column 9, lines 31-67) and
redistributing the representation (the resources are stored on the distributed network environment; column 4, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the notification of Jones with the specification of Duffy. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this so that the user, such as a buyer, has immediate access to any changes made to his order.

Claims 16-17 and 25-26 are rejected with the same rationale as claims 7-8 because they disclose an apparatus and article of manufacture for the invention, but have the same limitations as claims 7-8.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2157

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uzma Alam whose telephone number is (571) 272-3995. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday 9 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Uzma alam
Ua
August 23, 2005


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100